(e) whether it is also a fact that certain multinational drug companies have withdrawn their products after similar products being introduced by Indian companies whose price are even less than ten times;

(f) if so, the details of such instances; and

(g) what steps are being taken to safeguard the interest of consumer after implementation of GATT?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (g) Introduction of a product under brand name by an Indian company or a multinational company is a normal commercial practice and is not linked to GATT. Marketing of formulations by different manufacturers under different brand names is not monitored as such.

Annual review of list of bulk drugs

1322. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1371 given in the Rajya Sabha on 4th August, 1994 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government as well as Kelkar Committee had recommended annual review of list of bulk drugs and bring all those drugs under price control which had a turn-over of Rs. 50 lakhs or more:

(b) if so, when were the reviews undertaken and what is the outcome of each review; and

(c) what are the names of drugs included in the year 1993 and 1994 and how many cases are pending for review as on 31st July, 1994?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (c) Kelkar Committee, constituted for the purpose of identifying drugs to be kept under Category II of DPCO, 1987 had adopted as one of the criteria "to exclude those drugs from price control the turnover of which has been less than Rs. 50 lakhs in 1986. In view of the large number of representations on pricing aspects, including on the criteria adopted by the Kelkar Committee, the Government has since reviewed the price control system alongwith the other aspects of the Drug policy, 1986 and the decision in regard to the criteria to be adopted is given in the "Modifications in Drug Policy, 1986" copies of which are available in the Parliament Library. Accordingly, the new DPCO, which will contain the list of drugs that would be under price control on the basis of the said criteria is being formulated.

Selling of Doxycycline formulations without price approval

1323. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that leading drug companies like Pfizer, US Vitamins and other are selling their Doxycycline formulations without any price approval and if so, what price is being charged by them together with the price fixed by Government and since when;

(b) in what manner these companies have been defying Government and what steps have been taken to enforce the prices;

(c) whether it is also a fact that M/s. U.S. Vitamins are selling multivitamin and other formulations without any price approval, if so, what are the details and what action has been taken; and

(d) whether it is also a fact that change in management is being enforced in the company by manipulation, if so, what are the facts in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Use of DPEA Funds

1324. SHRI JAGIR SINGH DARD: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question No. 315 given in Rajya Sabha on 28th July, 1994 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Law Ministry advised the Ministry in 1990-91 that provision for using DPEA funds be incorporated into DPCO, 1987, if so, the details thereof;

(b) whether it is also a fact that former Development Commissioner (PI) was sitting over these paper and that he has not mentioned even during the review of 1986 policy that such an advice has been obtained from Law Ministry;

(c) if so, the reasons thereof; and

(d) whether it is a fact that neither the Minister-in-charge nor the Committee of Secretaries have been informed of the position, if so, what are the full facts and who is responsible for the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Provision for using DPEA Funds already exists under paragraph 14(2) of the Drug (Prices Control) Order, 1987.

(b) to (d) Do not arise.

Clearance to Pepsi and Indian organic Chemical Limited Project

1325. SHRI GAYA SINGH:
SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:

Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the foreign Investment Promotion Board has cleared a joint project between Pepsi and Indian Organic Chemicals Limited for manufacturing plastic PET bottles and import of plastic waste from the United States;

(b) whether it is also a fact that Indian and United States have not signed any waste trade agreement and hence it is violation of International law;

(c) whether Government are aware of the serious environmental and health problems in the event of import of plastic waste; and

(d) if so, the details in this regard and Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a), (c) and (d) Govt. of India has approved in October, 1993 a 100 per cent EOU project of Pepsico Inc., USA for manufacture of 20,000 MTs of Virgin Polyester chips of Beverage bottle grade. The project is being implemented by a company viz. M/s. Futura Polymers Ltd. which is a joint venture of Indian Organic Chemicals Limited (IOCL) and Pepsico having 48.72 per cent and 51.28 per cent of equity. PET waste is not used as a raw material for this project. There is no contract between IOCL and Pensico for import of PET waste from USA.

Government are well aware of the environmnetal and health problems in the event of import of plastic waste. Recycling of most of the plastic is non-hazardous provided toxic material has not been stored in it. Accordingly, as per the present import policy, import of all kinds of plastic scrap/waste except PET bottle waste is permissible only against an import licence. This has been done so as to avoid indiscriminate import of hazardous material and to encourage recycling of domestic waste of plastics